



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/601,078

06/20/2003

Kenneth Roger Jones

1033-SS00380

7047

60533

7590

06/09/2008

TOLER LAW GROUP
8500 BLUFFSTONE COVE
SUITE A201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

SOL, ANTHONY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2619

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/601,078	Applicant(s) JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner ANTHONY SOL	Art Unit 2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 2/29/2008 has been entered.

- Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 16 have been amended.
- Claims 1-19 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Pub. No. US 2003/0231206 A1 ("Armstrong").

Regarding claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 16-18,

AAPA discloses inquiring, from a remote location, a status of an upper-layer communication indicator wherein the status is observable by a visual inspection of the

indicator by an end-user (see Applicant's specification, pg. 9, para. 1035, *However, in prior art systems, higher-level communications are often terminated internally to the transceiver, without indicating to the end-user if the communications were successful or not. In such systems, to determine communication status may require opening a web browser on a connect computer, logging in to the transceiver, and **viewing information on communication status, for example, PPPoE authentication**, via a graphical user interface (GUI). These extra steps require end-user involvement and increase troubleshooting costs* -- In other words, the service technician would remotely ask for assistance from the subscriber/customer in viewing communication status of PPPoE (an upper-layer communication) and relaying the information to the service technician); entering the status into data storage (this step would be inherent since a service technician's would input the communication status in order to determine the next step in the troubleshooting).

AAPA does not explicitly disclose performing a first set of actions when the status indicates valid upper-layer communication; and performing a second set of actions when the status indicates invalid upper-layer communication.

Armstrong discloses in fig. 5, that when the ADSL Modem Main Page 500 shows a "PPPoE Status: Connected" 518 (claimed status indicates valid upper-layer communication), that the subscriber can "Close Window" 512 and continue Internet browsing (claimed performing a first set of actions)(see para. 58). Armstrong further discloses in fig. 6, Setup 610 which includes inputting Username 612 and Password 614 (claimed performing a second set of actions) in order to "Connect" 616 and wait for the

Art Unit: 2619

PPPoE light on the modem to turn **solid green** (claimed when the status indicates invalid upper-layer communication)(see para. 59). **Note** that the ADSL modem has a visual indicator that turns solid green when the PPPoE status is “connected,” thus, both AAPA and Armstrong discloses a visual indicator that is observable by the end user as claimed.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the troubleshooting method of AAPA to provide two sets of actions to be performed upon a visual inspection of upper-level communication status as taught by Armstrong. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the combination to trouble-shoot a DSL connection depending on communication status (see Applicant’s spec., pg. 9, para. 1053).

Regarding claims 7, 8, 19,

AAPA discloses that when problems arise, trouble shooting typically involves the access provider sending a technician to a customer premise (see Applicant’s spec, pg. 2, para. 1005).

Regarding claim 11,

AAPA shows in fig. 1, DSLAM 110.

Regarding claim 12,

AAPA discloses that LEDs provide low-level connection status (see Applicant's spec, pg. 2, para. 1006).

Regarding claim 13, 14, 15,

AAPA shows in fig. 5 various LEDs, all of which are admitted prior art, except PPPoE.

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Armstrong, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,981,039 B2 ("Cerami").

Regarding claim 5,

AAPA and Armstrong do not disclose that entering the status into data storage comprises a service technician entering data into an electronic job ticket.

Cerami discloses that a service technician creates a repair ticket (col. 10, lines 33-34).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the troubleshooting method of AAPA and Armstrong to create a repair ticket as taught by Cerami. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the combination to trouble-shoot a DSL connection depending on communication status (see Applicant's spec., pg. 9, para. 1053).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY SOL whose telephone number is (571)272-5949. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am - 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Wing F. Chan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619
6/6/08

/A. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2619
6/9/2008